



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of

Applicant : M. W. Beach, et al.
Serial No. : 09/244,304
Filed : 3 Feb 1999
Examiner : G. Akers
Group : 2164
Entitled : Preprocessor System and Method for Rejection of Duplicate Invoices
Docket No. : END919980071US1

Assistant Commissioner For Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

EXPRESS MAIL CERTIFICATE

"Express Mail" label number: EL598673285US

Date of Deposit: 29 May 2002

I hereby certify that the following attached paper or fee

Postcard
Express Mail Certificate
Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unavoidably (with attachments)
Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) Request Transmittal
Preliminary Amendment

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

JUDITH A. BECKSTRAND

(Name of person mailing paper or fee)


(Signature of person mailing paper or fee)

RECEIVED
JUN 04 2002
Technology Center 2100

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#20
part
of
#19

05/29/02

In Re Application of

Applicant : M. W. Beach, et al.
Serial No. : 09/244,304
Filed : 3 Feb 1999
Examiner : G. Akers
Group : 2164

Entitled : Preprocessor System and Method for Rejection of Duplicate Invoices

Docket No. : EN998071

Assistant Commissioner For Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that the following attached correspondence comprising:

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
LETTER RE SECOND DRAFT/PROPOSED CLAIM 1 AND INTERVIEW
SUMMARY

is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Technology Center TC2100 (After Final: Fax. No. 703 746-7238)

on 30 Jan 2002
(date)

SHELLEY M BECKSTRAND
(Typed or printed name of person signing certificate)

Shelley M Beckstrand

(Signature of person transmitting paper or fee)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of

Applicant : M. W. Beach, et al.
Serial No. : 09/244,304
Filed : 3 Feb 1999
Examiner : G. Akers
Group : 2164

Entitled : Preprocessor System and Method for Rejection of
Duplicate Invoices

Docket No. : EN998071

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

LETTER RE SECOND DRAFT/PROPOSED CLAIM 1 AND
INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir:

Further responsive to the Advisory Action of 1/11/02 from
Examiner Dr. G. Akers, and the telephonic interview of 1/17/02,
Applicants submit the following proposed claim drafts.

Interview Summary

An Interview Summary prepared by Examiner G. Akers dated 1/17/02
was mailed 1/18/02, indicating that Applicants are to provide a
separate record of the substance of the interview. Applicants'
attorney agrees with the substance as stated by the Examiner with
respect to the 1/17/02 interview.

Subsequent to the interview of 1/17/02, Applicants' attorney
faxed to the Examiner a proposed/draft claim 1 (see below), to which
the Examiner replied by leaving a telephone message with Applicants'
attorney on or about 1/18/02 to the effect that (1) a more specific
definition of the net sum method is required, and (2) that he would
have time to further consider the matter after the middle of

February.

Claim 1 Draft 1

Following is the first discussion draft for claim 1 previously provided to the Examiner.

1. [Thrice Amended, First Draft] Method for operating an account payable computing system, comprising the steps of:

preprocessing before introduction into an accounts payable data base original electronic invoices received from a vendor by using a net sum method for detecting [to identify] duplicate invoices, said net sum method including identifying as duplicate invoices those invoices for the same vendor, invoice number, purchase order billed and items billed for which the net sum of invoiced amounts is greater than zero;

introducing invoices not identified as duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base; and

electronically rejecting invoices identified as duplicate invoices back to said vendor without introducing said duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base.

Claim 1 [Twice Amended] and Claim 12 [Draft]

Claim 1 [Twice Amended] as currently entered in the case is set forth below, together with a new claim 12 [draft] depending therefrom which sets forth the specific steps used to determine duplicate invoices.

1. [Twice Amended] Method for operating an account payable computing system, comprising the steps of:

preprocessing before introduction into an accounts payable data base original electronic invoices received from a vendor to identify duplicate invoices, including identifying as duplicate invoices those invoices for the same vendor, invoice number, purchase order billed and items billed for which the net sum of invoiced amounts is greater than zero;

introducing invoices not identified as duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base; and

electronically rejecting invoices identified as duplicate invoices back to said vendor without introducing said duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base.

12. [Draft] The method of claim 1 [Twice Amended], said preprocessing step further including the steps of:

first sorting said original electronic invoices against production tables for same vendor and same vendor invoice number;

second sorting hits from said first sorting step for same purchase order billed;

third sorting hits from said second sorting step for same items billed on purchase order; and

fourth sorting hits from said third sorting step to determine those items having said net sum greater than zero.

The specific process of claim 12 [Draft] for calculating the net sum is set forth in applicants' Figure 2, which is described at page 11.

Summary

Both draft claims are submitted for discussion purposes only, without prejudice to further assertion, by appeal or otherwise, that Claim 1 (twice amended) should be allowed.

Applicants' attorney requests that the Examiner contact him at the number noted below before 11 Feb 2002 to determine if agreement can be reached as to the definition of allowable subject matter.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Shelley M. Beckstrand", is written over a horizontal line.

Shelley M Beckstrand
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 24,886

Phone: 607 687-9913
Fax: 607 687-7848

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of

Applicant : M. W. Beach, et al.
Serial No. : 09/244,304
Filed : 3 Feb 1999
Examiner : G. Akers
Group : 2164

Entitled : Preprocessor System and Method for Rejection of Duplicate Invoices

Docket No. : EN998071

Assistant Commissioner For Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that the following attached correspondence comprising:

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
DRAFT/PROPOSED CLAIM 1**

is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Technology Center
TC2100 (After Final: Fax. No. 703 746-7238)

on 17 Jan 2002

(date)

SHELLEY M BECKSTRAND

(Typed or printed name of person signing certificate)



(Signature of person transmitting paper or fee)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of

Applicant : M. W. Beach, et al.
Serial No. : 09/244,304
Filed : 3 Feb 1999
Examiner : G. Akers
Group : 2164



Entitled : Preprocessor System and Method for Rejection of Duplicate Invoices

Docket No. : EN998071

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2002

DRAFT/PROPOSED CLAIM 1

Examiner Dr. Akers,

Technology Center 2100

As we discussed earlier today, following is a draft/proposed claim 1 for your consideration.

1. [Thrice Amended] Method for operating an account payable computing system, comprising the steps of:

preprocessing before introduction into an accounts payable data base original electronic invoices received from a vendor by using a net sum method for detecting [to identify] duplicate invoices, said net sum method including identifying as duplicate invoices those invoices for the same vendor, invoice number, purchase order billed and items billed for which the net sum of invoiced amounts is greater than zero;

introducing invoices not identified as duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base; and

electronically rejecting invoices identified as duplicate invoices back to said vendor without introducing said duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base.

Thank you.

Shelley M Beckstrand
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 24,886

Phone: 607 687-9913
Fax: 607 687-7848

EN998071

1

S/N 09/244,304